REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated September 25, 2007. With this response, claims 1, 14 and 15 are amended and all pending claims 1-4 and 7-15 are presented for reconsideration and favorable action.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 7-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 1 has been amended and it is believed that the rejection may be withdrawn.

Further, in the Office Action the claims were rejected based upon 35 U.S.C. § 102 based upon Gokcebay et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,374,653). This was either alone or (regarding claims 10 and 11) in combination with Lin (U.S. Patent No. 5, 447,047). Applicant submits that U.S. Patent No. 6,374,653 does not disclose a remote transponder for exchanging a wireless signal. Gokcebay merely refers to a 1-wire bus connection. In particular, Gokcebay mentions at column 12, line 7:

> *The **contact** 28 may be formed as disclosed in U.S. Pat. No. 5,307,295, incorporated herein by reference, where the contact is disclosed as being spring-biased for engagement with a contact on a key;*

Moreover, at column 12, lines 40-42 of Gokcebay, it is further disclosed:

> *The **contact** 28 which establishes a one wire bus protocol for electrical connection to the key, is isolated from the plug,...*

Thus, it is clear that reference number 28 refers to a contact 28 and not a ferrite antenna, as alleged by the Examiner.

At column 16, lines 21-23 of Gokcebay, the connection between the contact 28 and the key is further described:

> *When the key 90 is inserted into the receiving cylinder, the key contact probe 97 makes contact with the cylinder contact unit 28.*

Gokcebay does not disclose an exchange of a wireless signal but merely refers to a one wire bus connection between the contacts 97a or contact probe 97 with contact 28. The key has to be brought into direct contact with the locking cylinder; it is not possible to use the key to remotely activate the locking cylinder, as it is the case in the present invention. Thus, it is clear that Gokcebay merely

disclose a key but not a "remote transponder".

Thus, as discussed in prior communications, Applicant would like to emphasize that Gokcebay does not refer to a remote transponder for exchanging wireless signal and that the contact 28 is not a ferrite bar antenna but merely a contact. In this connection, we would appreciate receiving the Examiner's detailed comments with regard to said features. So far, the Examiner has not commented on these features in detail but merely postulated that Gokcebay comprises a remote transponder and a ferrite antenna.

With regard to the amended feature (b) that a knob is located on the cylinder body, the Examiner argued that Figures 18, 18A and 18B of Gokcebay also shows a knob 196 on the cylinder body. In particular, the Examiner interprets the term "on" as a function word to indicate position in. It appears that such a broad interpretation on the term "on" is unjustified. However, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the knob "extends from the cylinder body". This is not shown by Gokcebay.

Independent claim 1 has been amended with additional mechanical features as claimed in claims 10 and 11. In other words in addition to the electronic features of present independent claim 1, the mechanical mechanism as explained with regard to Figures 5a to 5c have been added.

As preferred embodiment of the engagement means 30 is explained in Figures 5a to 5c. there are three main components, namely (from left to right) the drive mechanism 32, the coupling element 34 and the take-off mechanism 33. The drive mechanism 32 is in contact with the knob 14, whereas the take-off mechanism 33 is in contact with the locking mechanism.

-In the decoupled state, the drive mechanism 32 does not transmit a rotational force or moment to the take-off mechanism 33 since the coupling element 34 does not transmit a rotational movement but rather moves axially or transversal to the right (see Figure 5b).

In other words, as long as the coupling element 34 is allowed to move freely forth and back axially, it is in the decoupled state. In this state, the bolt 39 rotating together with the drive mechanism 32 will only cause the coupling element 34 to move axially forth and back but not to make it rotate (see Figure 5a and 5B).

In other words, the axial movement of the coupling element 34 prevents a form closure between the drive mechanism 32 and the take-off mechanism 33.

Only when this axial movement is no longer allowed by means of a blocking element 44, the drive mechanism 32 will transmit a rotational moment via the intermediate coupling element 34 to the take-off mechanism 33 which eventually allows the locking or unlocking step. In other words, in the coupled state a form closure between the drive mechanism 32 and the take-off mechanism 32 is provided.

Independent claim 1 has been amended with the additional features of former claims 10 and 11. The features of former claims 10 and 11 are slightly amended to further emphasize that that coupling element moves axially in a decoupled state and that the coupling element 34 rotates in a coupled state which essentially causes a rotational movement of take-off mechanism 33.

With regard to the subject-matter of former dependent claims 10 and 11, the Examiner denied inventive step in view of Gokcebay combined with Line (US 5,447,047). In particular, the Examiner takes the position that Gokcebay discloses an "engagement means (200) on the distal end of the lock cylinder".

However, it appears that the Examiner interprets the features of Gokcebay again very broadly. Reference number 200 of Gokcebay refers to a radio device, as disclosed for example in column 14, line 47, and not to an engagement means as set forth in amended claim 1.

New independent claim 1 has been clarified in that the decoupled state and the coupled state are explained in more detail. In particular, in a decoupled state the rotational movement of the drive mechanism 32 causes an essentially axial movement of the coupling element 34 such that the rotational movement of the drive mechanism 32 is not transmitted to a rotational movement of the take-off mechanism 33. However, in a coupled state, a rotational movement of the drive mechanism 32 causes a rotational movement of the coupling element 34 which further transmits its rotational movement to the take-off mechanism 33. The switching between the coupled and decoupled state is achieved with the blocking mechanism 44, which either allows an axial movement of the coupling element 34 or not.

The Examiner argues that the disc 35 and the projection 351 of Line are the corresponding parts to the drive mechanism 32 and the take-off mechanism 33 of the present invention.

However, this is not the point of the coupling mechanism of Lin's invention. Lin's driving

mechanism is the handle 3 with stub, the take-off mechanism is the disc 55 connected to the shaft 42. The coupling element is the rod 52 with its extensions 512, which can be moved into the coupled position either by means of magnetic force from a coil powered by an electronic access control unit 11 or by means of a mechanic override activated by turning a key resulting in a disengagement of a projection 351 and a depression 513, thus pushing the coupling device 52 into the coupled state.

In contrast to the present invention, the disc 35 and projection 351, being the moving force of the coupling element 52, are used for switching between a coupled and a decoupled state. However, such a switching is done with the blocking mechanism 44 in the present invention.

Moreover, a rotational movement of disc 35 in Lin results in an axial movement of projection 351 to achieve a coupled state. In the present invention, the axial movement is conducted only by the coupling element 34 in the decoupled state.

In other words, there are two independent rotational movements necessary in Lin for opening a door. Firstly, the disc 35 has to be rotated for setting the lock from the decoupled state to the coupled state. This is done with a key. Secondly, the door is opened by rotating the grip 3.

In the present invention, the switching between the coupled and decoupled state is done with the blocking mechanism 44, which is a different approach.

Thus, the subject-matter amended independent claim 1 is novel and inventive over the combination of Gokcebay and Lin.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to deposit account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Christopher R. Christenson/

Christopher R. Christenson, Reg.No. 42,413
Suite 1400
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone:(612) 334-3222 Fax:(612) 334-3312

JKC:rev:lrs